

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

RONALD G. TAYLOR, JR.,

Petitioner,

Case Number: 05-71041

v.

HON. VICTORIA A. ROBERTS

JAMES M. BATZER,

Respondent.

**ORDER DENYING PETITIONER’S “MOTION FOR STAY OF STATE COURT
PROCEEDINGS; NOTICE OF IRREGULARITY IN THESE PROCEEDINGS
AND OBJECTION TO COUNTERFEIT ORDER OF SUMMARY DISMISSAL
WITHOUT PREJUDICE; NOTICE OF SUBJECTION TO EXTORTION
BY OFFICERS OF THIS COURT”**

Petitioner Ronald G. Taylor, Jr., filed a *pro se* petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. On March 31, 2005, the Court issued an Order of Summary Dismissal Without Prejudice, summarily dismissing the petition because the Court could not discern the conviction Petitioner challenged or the grounds on which he sought habeas corpus relief. Now before the Court is Petitioner’s “Motion for Stay of State Court Proceedings; Notice of Irregularity in these Proceedings; and Objection to Counterfeit Order of Summary Dismissal Without Prejudice; Notice of Subjection to Extortion by Officers of this Court.”

The Court construes the portion of Petitioner’s motion objecting to the Order of Summary Dismissal as a request for reconsideration. The Local Rules for the Eastern

District of Michigan state that in a motion for rehearing or reconsideration “the movant must not only demonstrate a palpable defect by which the court and the parties have been misled but also show that correcting the defect will result in a different disposition of the case.” L.R. 7.1(g)(3). A “palpable defect” is a “defect which is obvious, clear, unmistakable, manifest or plain.” Olson v. The Home Depot, 321 F. Supp. 2d 872, 874 (E.D. Mich. 2004) (Gadola, J.). Further, the Local Rules also provide that “the court will not grant motions for rehearing or reconsideration that merely present the same issues ruled upon by the court, either expressly or by reasonable implication.” L.R. 7.1(g)(3). Petitioner’s objections to the Order of Summary Dismissal lack any coherent argument. Therefore, the Court shall deny the request for reconsideration.

The remaining arguments in Petitioner’s Motion are moot given that the habeas petition is no longer pending in this Court.

Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED** that Petitioner’s “Motion for Stay of State Court Proceedings; Notice of Irregularity in these Proceedings; and Objection to Counterfeit Order of Summary Dismissal Without Prejudice; Notice of Subjection to Extortion by Officers of this Court” is **DENIED**.

S/Victoria A. Roberts

Victoria A. Roberts

United States District Judge

Dated: May 10, 2005

The undersigned certifies that a copy of this document was served on the attorneys of record and pro se petitioner by electronic means or U.S. Mail on May 10, 2005.

s/Caryl A. Pinegar
Deputy Clerk